

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application is respectfully requested in view of the present Amendment. The Official Action, mailed April 5, 2007, has been carefully reviewed. By this Amendment, claims 30 31, 32 and 34 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected claims 30-31 and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Vanacore reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,672,654). It is respectfully submitted that a review of this reference reveals that it does not anticipate, disclose, suggest or make obvious the Applicants' invention. The Applicants' invention is directed to an improved guard tour system that includes electronic hardware and software for use by patrol guards or officers to monitor desired areas of one or more buildings or facilities. The patrol guard or officer making an inspection or security tour of a facility is provided with a hand-held electronic touch button reader. When the patrol guard or officer reaches a checkpoint during a tour, he touches the reader to a touch button at the checkpoint. The touch button contains pre-programmed information. The touch button reader reads this information, whereupon the patrol guard or officer proceeds with his tour. The checkpoints do not have to be read in a particular sequence. Instead, the Applicants' invention only requires that a specified visitation frequency be maintained for each checkpoint, i.e., a specified number of visits during a specified period of time. This permits checkpoints to be visited in completely random order.

At the end of the tour, the patrol guard or officer downloads the collected information or data into a central computer control station through the use of a mobile

downloader, a direct downloader or a modem downloader. Following downloading, the central computer is operable to print reports with respect to the tour.

It should be noted that the Applicants' invention does not require a predefined sequence of checkpoint visitations. The only requirement is that a given checkpoint be visited a specified number of visits during a specified period of time. Thus, checkpoint visits can be completely random in nature, and the order in which checkpoints are visited can be readily changed. The visitations to checkpoints are controlled by a set of rules that are defined by the method set forth in claims 30-34.

The Vanacore reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,672,654) discloses a security system arrangement utilizing a standard PBX for monitoring a plurality of concurrently administered guard tours. A control processor within the PBX administers the security monitoring processing operation. The processing operation monitors the activities of tour guards as the guard progresses through one or more tours. Each tour comprises a finite list of sequentially defined checkpoints where each checkpoint is a designated conventional station set of the PBX. A security controller activates the security system by dialing the appropriate feature code at a central control facility. The security controller then selects one or more available tours by dialing a tour code. Following the selection and activation of a tour, a tour guard dials a check-in code at each checkpoint and progresses sequentially through the checkpoints contained in the list comprising the selected tour or tours. The tour guard has an allotted amount of time in which to reach each of the designated checkpoints included in the tour sequence. The tour is successfully completed when the tour guard sequentially checks in within the allotted time at each of the designated checkpoints included in the tour. If, however, the proper

check-in sequence is not followed or if the allotted time period elapses before the tour guard reaches the next checkpoint in the sequence, an alarm is generated indicating that the tour sequence has been disrupted.

From the foregoing discussion, it is apparent that there are numerous differences in the system disclosed in the Vanacore reference and the system utilized by the Applicants' invention. For example, the Vanacore reference specifically states that "These checkpoints are sequentially ordered and the tour guard is required to execute his/her tour according to the checkpoint sequence" (column 3, lines 28-31). The tour guard may start the tour at any checkpoint in the sequence, however, "Once the tour begins, the tour guard must progress through the tour according to the predefined sequence of checkpoints" (column 3, lines 34-36). In contrast, in the Applicants' invention, the checkpoints do not have to be read in a particular sequence. Instead, the Applicants' invention only requires that a specified visitation frequency be maintained for each checkpoint, i.e., a specified number of visits during a specified period of time, permitting the checkpoints to be read in a completely random order. In addition, the Vanacore system requires that "following a check-in at each one of the designated checkpoints, the tour guard has only a prescribed amount of time in which to reach each of the next designated checkpoints in the sequence" (column 3, lines 41-44). This is not the case in the Applicants' invention since it is possible for any checkpoint to be the next checkpoint visited because the checkpoints do not have to be visited in a particular order or sequence.

In view of the foregoing differences between the Applicants' invention and the invention disclosed in the Vanacore reference, it is respectfully submitted that the

Applicants' invention is not anticipated, disclosed, suggested or obvious in view of this reference. However, in order to more specifically define the Applicants' invention, independent claim 30 has been amended to include the limitation that the visits to the checkpoints may be in a random order and to further clarify same. Also, claims 31, 32 and 34 have been amended to clarify same. In view of the amendment of independent claim 30, it is respectfully submitted that this claim, and all claims dependent thereon, are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Vanacore reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,672,654). In view of the amendment of independent claim 30 on which this claim depends, it is respectfully submitted that claim 32 is similarly allowable.

In view of this Amendment, it is respectfully submitted that this case is in condition for allowance, and such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Hudak, Reg. No. 27,340
Attorney for Applicants
29425 Chagrin Blvd., Suite #304
Cleveland, Ohio 44122
(216) 292-2900

Date: September 14, 2007